DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 172 SO 022 432

AUTHOR Marsh, Margaret
TITLE Art Appreciation in Practice in Sydney, Australia.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; *Cooperative Learning; Foreign Countries; Secondary Education; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (New South Wales)

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this paper are: to describe art education in New South Wales, Australia; to explain the Student Centered Art Appreciation (SCAA) Model; and to examine how and why the model works in the classroom. Art education is explored from four perspectives or theoretical frameworks: (1) the New South Wales Visual Arts Syllabus; (2) the SCAA Model; (3) an adaptation of the model for a wider category of purposes; and (4) cognitive theories of educational psychology related to the cognitive processes that can occur with the use of the model. Issues of learner awareness, art language, art history, and the need to employ multiple models also are addressed. There is a need for further research; however, it is suggested that the SCAA is a good model that works in the classroom because of the social context in which learning takes place. (LBG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354172

ART APPRECIATION IN PRACTICE IN SYDNEY AUSTRALIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARGARET MARSH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 432

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ART APPRECIATION IN PRACTICE IN SYDNEY AUSTRALIA.

Margaret Marsh, St Clare's College, Waverley, 2024, AUSTRALIA

1. OBJECTIVES.

A theoretical model requires practitioner inquiry as to its applicability to the classroom within a particular syllabus. The objectives of this paper are

1). to describe Art Education in New South Wales, Australia, where every student is required to do 200 hours of Visual Arts in the Junior High School years, and may then elect to continue visual arts education for a further 2 or 4 years. The syllabus integrates art theory and art making and focuses on the student's world as the stimulus source.

2). to explain the Student Centred Art Appreciation Model (Darby 1988) and to discuss my use of this model, and my adaptation and extension of it, for art appreciation in the classroom, in Sydney Australia.

3) to explain how and why the model works in the classroom for art appreciation and how learner awareness of the processes involved is crucial to the student extending the use of the model beyond the classroom.

PERSPECTIVES OR THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are four frameworks.

1.) the New South Wales Visual Arts Syllabus, within which this action based classroom research takes place. This syllabus is a K to 12 Approach to Visual Arts education. It emphasises the key importance of the students' local (Australian) environment as a stimulus. The theoretical and practical aspects of the visual arts are integrated. It specifies the types of learning experiences to be undertaken by students ie perceiving, responding, evaluating, organising and manipulating. As a result of the experiences gained in studying images and objects, students are expected to think imaginatively about their own artmaking and that of others; communicate their ideas, feelings and beliefs in both visual and verbal ways; understand traditional and contemporary images, and their meanings and purposes; to respond to these images and objects and appreciate them; to integrate this study with their own artmaking. An important aspect of this syllabus in practice is the appreciation of artworks, both those made by the students themselves and those made by others.

2.) The Student Centred Art Appreciation Model, (the S.C.A.A.) was developed by Max Darby, in Victoria Australia. It is a synthesis of the thinking of art education researchers Feldman (1970), Mittler (1980), Eisner (1972,1979), Larnier (1987), and Chapman (1978).
Their various approaches and Darby's have in common the four processes of Description, Analysis, Interpretation and Judgment. Darby's unique contribution is his development of a workable model where the emphasis is on active student participation via the personal responses of the student, not on the artwork itself. It uses everyday language, is arranged in sequential steps, and it is non-threatening as it does not depend on an art history context. (see appendix A and B)

3.) My adaptation and extension of the model to suit a wider category of purposes. I have extended the model in two ways -i) by the addition of art language lables, to allow all students using the model to become aware of the processes they are using, and - ii) by the addition of conceptual art language to allow senior students to use it for Art Criticism. (see appendix C and D)

4.) Cognitive theories of educational psychology related to the processes that can occur in the classroom with the user of this model - Reciprocal Teaching and in broader terms, Cognitive Apprenticeship. The art room is a learning environment where the students do have the opportunity to observe, engage in and internalise expert strategies.The interactive use of the model in my art room creates a learning environment, which allows students to gain a set of cognitive skills through the processes of observation and guided and supported practice. The environment of the artroom, with the artwork present even if in a mediated form, and an involved and enthusiastic teacher, creates the appropriate context where she can provide the functions of modeling, coaching, scaffolding and fading. Thus this learning environment increases

learner awareness and the student internalises these processes and solves problems, that is appreciates artworks and over time learns to generalise the use of these cognitive skills to similar problems and to a wider network of artworks. The operational use of the model creates a three way interactive environment between student, artwork and teacher.

METHODS AND/OR TECHNIQUES

The S.C.A.A. was tested by myself, over two and a half years in a Catholic all-girls school in Sydney, Australia. It was tested with students from year 7, (age 12,) to Year 12, (age 17). A wide range of artworks were used over this period with these students. The artworks included traditional well known works, Australian artworks from the colonial to the contemporary period, works from popular culture including street art, video clips, advertisements, and mass produced photographic images. With senior classes the model was used with more complex artworks, aboriginal artworks, feminist artworks, and abstract art. We also used the model as a tool for students to analyse their own artmaking, thus legimatising the work and increasing understanding of the processes of making an artwork.

The model was used in the classroom, in an interactive, verbal and written mode in class periods of 55 minutes. Class sizes vary from 30 students in the compulsory junior classes of Years 7 and 8, to small Senior classes ranging from 12 to 20. Students often followed up the classroom interactive experience by writing an essay for homework. At the end of year 12, the senior visual arts students sit an external written exam in art theory. They also submit a major piece of artmaking which is also assessed externally. These are requirements for the Visual Arts Section of the Higher School Certificate Examination. Success in this exam overall and success in visual Arts is the main requirement to gain access to a university place in an art school. A typical example of a question for this exam is: "Look at one of these plates" (these are images the student has not seen before this exam) "Discuss the aesthetic and imaginative qualities, the artists method of organization, use of symbols, materials and techniques, and the ideas and feelings conveyed by the artwork"

The model was tested by myself with Senior Students as to its appropriateness as preparation for these questions.

RESULTS/ CONCLUSIONS/ POINT OF VIEW/

The results of my ongoing investigation of this model revealed its many strengths and also a number of weaknesses. The model is very satisfactory for the purposes it was intended ie to help students get a better understanding of and an appreciation of artworks. It is non-threatening as it does not depend on the student having a history context background, it uses everyday language, the conceptual basis of the model is very sound and it's flexibility allows its adaptation to a wide variety of artworks, in a variety of medias.

However, my experience with the model, and the reasons that lead to my extensions of it, were its limitations as a model for art criticism, a cognitive level above art appreciation, and its failure to indicate to the students using it, the processes that they were using. This latter extension was achieved by the addition of conceptual art language. as shown in appendix D.

An additional outcome was an increase in students awareness of their visual environment, and an increase in their self concept of their ability to understand this environment and to form opinions based on a confident understanding.

EDUCATIONAL/ SCIENTIFIC IMPORTANCE OF STUDY.

The use of the model fits very appropriately into learning techniques developed for use in other disciplines, and which were applied, in this study, to the Visual Arts classroom. Models, such as the Student Centred Art Appreciation Model and my extensions of it, can be used to develop strategies in the student, which she can use to apply to a wider network of artworks and to an ever demanding visual world. The testing of this theoretical model demonstrated how and why it

works in the classroom, in practice. The study of how students can best learn the aesthetics, and the strategies to appreciate and to be critically aware of artworks, can be approached by the testing of such models.

These personal response models work in the classroom for art appreciation because of the social context in which learning takes place. The interactive environment creates a happy busy context; each student is expected from the beginning to contribute in the group problem solving processes; each student contributes to the other and to the final outcome; there is the availability of a model (the teacher and the better students); there are clear expectations from the teacher and the social reward of praise in front of one's peers and the opportunity to impress one's peers with original ideas and comments. At the focus of all this interaction is another "person" the **artwork** which is "created" by the group and whose "soul' is slowly revealed and interpreted and loved "appreciatively". This is a really satisfying outcome of the whole process. One of the best parts of being a visual arts teacher is to hear a comment like this one from Rita Giacannetis in a Year 11 class -"Miss, I never knew there could be so much in a painting.

The Student Centred Art Appreciation Model-The S.C.A.A.
HOW DOES IT WORK IN THE CLASSROOM ?

I began using the model in 1989 and I had not considered the idea that it might not work, or that the model had been developed theoretically, rather than in practice in the classroom. Actually, I had not thought much at all about its development - I had just enjoyed using it - it seemed so practical and so suited to students. And now I had learnt that the author was a "theoretician" not a practising teacher as Max Darby developed the model in work for his thesis.

I knew from my personal classroom experience that the model did work. But **how** and **why** did it work? I began to analyse what was happening in my art appreciation classes. This paper developed from these questions.

For American audiences I need to explain the Visual Arts Syllabus in use in N.S.W. The students enter High School after seven years of schooling - K to 6. They remain in High Schools, called secondary schools, for Years 7-12. After this they go to University, Technical and Further Education Colleges or into employment. The new Visual Arts Syllabus is a K -12 syllabus; (the K-6 component became mandatory in 1990). The teaching of Visual Arts (and Music) has been a compulsory part of secondary education since the 1960s. Every student is required to do 200 hours of Visual Arts in the Junior High School years. The focus in this non elective course is on contemporary art, Australian art and the everyday world of the student.The student is encouraged to explore a wide variety of media and to relate his art making to his experiences and to his study of art. Students may then elect to continue Visual Arts education for a further 2 or 4 years.

The Years 11-12 Visual Arts experiences are an advance on K-10 years' experience in that the students explore the complexities of their own personalities, their own lives and the structures that give meaning to the world around them. They achieve a broader grasp of the purposes and possibilities of creative imagination in visual arts. They develop a high degree of technical competence and acquire a wider range of expressive skills. They seek more diverse and subtle ways of symbolic expression. They develop a higher degree of self-determination in their aesthetic direction.

At the higher level of study students are expected to show their powers of discrimination, analysis and critical judgment of expressive visual images and objects. They are expected to show they can respond sensitively and to appreciate with empathy. They are expected to record their participation in studying images and objects in visual arts process diaries.

The first part of this paper is a narrative. It describes what the model is, my discovery of it as a tool for art appreciation, and my experiences using it in a Catholic Girls School, (secondary school) in Sydney, in 1989 ,1990 and 1991; (because my experience is with female students,

the gender reference to the student will be "she" throughout this paper; the teacher will also be referred to as "she".) I also make a critical analysis of Darby's model, discussing its strengths and its limitations.

In the second half of the paper, I use my classroom expertise, combined with my theoretical background in educational psychology, to look at some issues, that are at the forefront of current educational research into cognitive processes in the classroom. The use of the *Student Centred Art Appreciation Model,* in Visual Arts classrooms, embraces and questions these issues.

WHAT IS THE S.C.A.A. MODEL?

The *Student Centred Art Appreciation Model*, which I will refer to as the S.C.A.A. model from here on, was developed by Max Darby in Victoria, as a strategy, based on students' personal responses, for the appreciation of artworks. An fuller understanding of the author's goals and intentions is available by reading Darby (1988a.) and Darby (1988b.)

Darby states that art appreciation goals should
1) encourage students to consider and develop their own values, opinions and views, via personal response.
2) encourage students to develop the ability to describe, analyse, interpret and compare different kinds of images and objects.
3) encourage students to make an aesthetic response to their own environment and its everyday objects and experiences, including those not traditionally acknowledged to be artworks.
4) the process be an active one and not passive and that it be practical ie in some ways integrated with art making.

The model was originally presented by Darby in "Images in Life" published by the Victorian Ministry of Education. In subsequent reading and research for his thesis (1988) the model was refined. He reviewed the literature of art education theoreticians Feldman (1970), Mittler (1980), Eisner (1972, 1979), Chapman (1978) and Lanier (1987).

Darby's work is a **synthesis** ,in some ways, of the thinking of these researchers. Within the various approaches adopted for art criticism, four distinct processes - description, analysis, interpretation and judgment- were common aspects. Feldman places considerable importance on the need to avoid making decisions too quickly, while Mittler and Lanier acknowledge the importance of the student's initial response. Feldman stresses the importance of "aesthetic emotion", and the need to allow time for sensations, impressions, associations and half-formed valuations to interact.

Darby uses these processes of description, analysis, interpretation and judgement. His unique contribution is (a) his emphasis on active student involvement via personal responses and personal preferences; and (b) a workable model whereby the processes can be carried out in the classroom. Although others had implied that the student be involved it is *The Student Centred Art Appreciation Model* that makes this a possibility.

The model **is oriented to the student,** and stresses the student and not the artwork as the centre of the process. The "student-centredness" of Darby's approach implies a philosophical difference, that makes it an exciting and valuable tool for art appreciation, for both student and art teacher.

Darby's approach is based on the assumption that the student will **not** delay the process of judgment, no matter how hard we may try to prevent this. So he acknowledges this with his initial Step "What is your first impression of the work?" I also have found this first step very valuable; the belligerent student can say "Its yuk! I hate pictures with nude ladies," a shyer student can say "I like all the patterns and colours in the background". This immediate personal response is serving more than one purpose. The need to judge it has been safely expressed; the processes of gaining access to the work can proceed, because the sequential Steps of the S.C.A.A.

Model do inhibit further evaluation and do allow time for descriptions, impressions, associations, aesthetic and expressive responses to interact. Although the steps need not be followed in the suggested sequence, they do need to be carried out.

The model gives to the students a personal place to start from, and a pathway via the gathering of visual facts, into an involvment with the artwork. By then the apprehension of "having to understand it", as a whole, has been stalled. The artwork is accessible, the processes of analysis and interpretation can be carried out; and both teacher and student feel at the end of the lesson that they have understood and appreciated the work.

As the focus is on the student, the language of the model is that of the student, not the informed art critic. It is not complex; it is ordinary everyday language with some art words, mainly the art elements and principles, included. The language of the model does not intimidate. It is friendly.

MY USE of the *STUDENT CENTRED ART APPRECIATION MODEL.*

My experience using the S.C.A.A model has been very positive,in practice, **in the classroom.** In N.S.W. students are required to make responses to artworks they have not previously seen. Prior to finding this model, and in response to the new N.S.W. Visual Art Syllabus, I had used a check list of elements, principles and purposes to apply to these "unseen" artworks, in an attempt to teach the students how to better understand them and appreciate them. This did not work very well. Then I began using a simple "Feldman type" three question model -What do I see? - How do I react? and - What does it mean? This worked a lot better, as the emphasis was on the student responding, rather than my asking structured questions.

In Term 2 1989 I came across the S.C.A.A. model in Australian Art Education, (Dec1988), and began using it with senior students, to prepare them for the "unseen" section of the N.S.W. H.S.C. Visual Arts paper. It was a small class; I had not taught them prior to 1989 and they were very undisciplined in their thinking, had little art history background, and little understanding of aesthetics. My strategy was to deliberately try to put myself in the same place as these students, to choose artworks mostly unknown to me, and to do no formal preparation at all for these lessons. (This decision was to prove very valuable to me.)

We would choose a print, pin it up on the wall, and begin a process of discovery and sharing. We would write down responses (in sentences), read them out, discuss them and move on through the Steps of the model. The very positive part of this process, I noticed, was the way we shared the experience and that it was fun. It seemed that the process of appreciation was one where we discovered and "created" the painting. The girls found, and shared, extraordinary things in the paintings and made personally relevant interpretations of them. They were later able to attempt, with some confidence, the "unseen" artwork on the H.S.C. paper and perform above predicted ability level.

Following this sucessful experience I began using the S.C.A.A. model with all levels of "elective' classes. These are classes where the student has chosen to do art. I also used it, in a simplified version with the junior, general experience, art classes. I used it with paintings, video clips, advertisments, mass produced media photographs, street art and sculpture. My students also used the same model, the S.C.A.A., to analyse **their own artworks,** thus integrating their art making and art studying. I also used it as a method for teaching art history to junior classes. Again I found the use of the model very satisfying and successful.

PRACTICE AND THEORY

As I reflected on my experiences as a practioner using this model, I became aware of some important aspects of the theory and practice of using models to promote understanding. I had no colleagues with whom I could discuss what I was doing- for me it was a period of personal discovery about the processes occurring in the classroom and about my own teaching practice. It was a period of professional growth and of exciting job satisfaction. I reflected on why the S.C.A.A. model was so appealing and so successful as a classroom tool. I think it satisfies, my

strong personal need to nurture - a personality trait present in many teachers. The interactive processes that occur between teacher and student, while using the S.C.A.A. model are very similiar to those of child centred mothering practices, which promote active participation by the child. In contrast many class room practices have historically been authoritian, relegating the student to a passive receiver of knowledge.

For me, the model does work in the classroom. But, I believe its success also depends on the skills of the teacher and her willingness and enthusuiasm to be personally involved. And her willingness to allow the students to pretend they are detectives and to look for clues and supporting evidence. Lisa, a Year 12 student, took one lesson for me with a Year 7 class. It was very interesting for me to watch how she modeled herself on my style, not criticising but reinforcing their personal responses and leading them through the Steps of the model. She used an Albert Tucker image she had studied and with which she was very familiar. Afterwards she said, "Those little kids are amazing. They said things about that painting that I've not seen. It's exciting to do it this way and let them discover it for themselves." So what cognitive processes are happening when the S.C.A.A. model is used in the classroom ? In the second part of this paper I will discuss the "recipricol teaching " environment, which I believe occurs with this model.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE MODEL

I have outlined my positive experiences using the S.C.A.A. model. It creates an exciting environment in the classroom, it works for the purpose it was designed - to help kids get a better understanding of and an appreciation of artworks; kids like using it; it doesn't stress the context of the artwork and therefore is non-threatening; its language is easily understood; because it is oriented to the student, and stresses personal response, the students experiences an involvment with the artwork.

I have used the model in a variety of situations for which it was not designed. Nevertheless, a good model, as this one is, should be sufficiently flexible for adaptation by practitioners to suit their particular needs. And this model is flexible. I teach students from age 12 to age 18 and use a wide range of artworks in appreciation classes. The conceptual basis of the model is sound, and as a practioner who has used the model extensively, it is I believe, far more adaptable than Darby intended, or believes it to be. My experience showed that the *Student Centred Art Appreciation Model* satisfies many requirements of a good conceptual model. It is familiar in its language, it is appropriate for many students learning to appreciate artworks. It is very appropriate for use as an interactive model between student, artwork and teacher.

But the flexibility that is its strength also poses a limitation. It is inadequate **In the form it is presented.** (but not in its conceptual basis), for conditions where a more rigorous criticism or more emphasis on judgment is needed. In N.S.W. the Visual Arts students sit for a very demanding H.S.C. written exam.

An example of a question is .....Look at 1 Plate
(the student has not seen this "unseen"artwork before this exam).
"Discuss the aesthetic and imaginative qualities, the artist's method of organization, use of symbols and materials, and the ideas and feelings conveyed by the artwork." As it is presented, the model is inadequate as a tool to apply to an artwork, to respond to this question.

To explain this point I will again use a personal example. Last year my Year 12 Visual Arts students did the Catholic Schools Trial H.S.C. paper. They used the S.C.A.A. model as a tool; their responses, on the whole, did not answer the question. They had a method of attack into even the more obscure images, they could write several pages of appreciation, but then did not know how to organise and manipulate the information. The ability to reflect on what they had described and analysed and to evaluate and to answer the question, was not available to them.

The model provided structure, but the students were not cognitively aware of what strategies they were actually using. The model was working in that they felt involved in the processes of discovering analysing and interpreting ; but they could not **critically analyse** the artwork;

they could not move up a cognitive level, and **be aware of** the processes they had used, and manipulate them to answer the specific question.

So what was the S.C.A.A. lacking? I believed that we had used the model correctly, in an interactive way, and that with practice it had became more their model and less my model. I also realised that the model had not gone far enough. It is drifting somewhere between juniors and seniors, trying to be too available, to suit too many needs. It is lacking a **labelled** conceptual framework to make it the appropriate model for the more advanced Senior classes and it needs **more art language**. I began to modify it, in the absence of anything else, to suit the needs of these senior students. (overheads here)
These overheads explain an extension of the model to suit higher ability senior students. This was my need to adapt it to suit my conditions.

But is the S.C.A.A. a good model for the purposes it was designed? A good model should be
COMPLETE - contain all the essential parts,
CONCISE - at the appropriate level of detail,
LOGICAL- should contain parts and rules as to how they interact,
CONCRETE - either a visual model or presented in a familiar way, APPROPRIATE - to the student for his particular age and ability level with appropriate vocabulary and organization.

By these criteria, the model has limitations.
It is COMPLETE in that it does contain the essential Steps; but there are too many parts within each step and too many words and is therefore NOT CONCISE enough. It is over wordy and too complex for Junior classes;
The thinking behind it is LOGICAL, yet it is illogical in that there are no linking statements to explain how the whole model operates; to explain how the images being described and analysed can be used to reach an interpretation.
It is CONCRETE and practical, especially its language, and it can be transcribed into a visual form.
Is it APPROPRIATE? At what age and ability level of the student was the S.C.A.A. model aimed? There is such a wide range of abilities in any classroom. Somewhere around the Year 10, age 15 level it is probably best suited as it is presented. But i believe Darby has written it for teachers, rather than students, and therefore is relying on them to adapt it to their needs.

It is designed for students who have little knowledge of art history, or even exposure to art works beyond the media and popular culture. Darby also points out it is also designed for students who have too much knowledge as they need a personal framework. The S.C.A.A. model **seems** to eliminate the need for a context and specific art language.

Since the dominant "language" of an artwork will vary with the time, period, and the culture in which it was produced, this characteristic of the model is useful. It is well suited to the student who has limited cultural background and lower ability. It is difficult for her to know to begin to appreciate an artwork. It is important therefore that she has a direct experience of the artwork and direct access to the art work via a process that is familiar and non threatening. It is important to have an "access" that can bypass the need to be familiar with a particuliar visual language. The value of the experience, is in the personal response of the student, not in the possibility of impressing some other person, be it the artist, a teacher, or an examiner.

The student is subjected to now, and will be for the rest of her life, a continual barrage of visual imagery. She needs to make sense of this, needs to be able to see it critically and to be able to understand how it influences her opinions and shapes her life. These are the goals of art appreciation.

THE TEACHER AND THE S.C.A.A.
For the Visual Arts teacher who may be struggling to cope with the demands of a new curriculum eg in N.S.W., "to analyse unseen artworks", the model is very appropriate. It is useful, both in

the classroom and for personal use as preparation of more structured theory classes. For art teachers working in isolation, or without informed colleagues, it is a most useful tool. Many art teachers are untrained in approaches to art appreciation and therefore apprehensive about these classes. They tend to focus on artmaking and neglect art appreciation. For them the S.C.A.A. is as friendly and non threatening as it is for the student.

Some teachers are more comfortable with focusing on art history approaches to appreciation. I have observed that teachers without much personal accumulated background in art history/art theory will stick closely to other peoples opinions. They will religiously use notes from art books and overvalue other art teachers notes, rather than trust their own opinions. They have low self concept of their ability in the area of art appreciation and art theory. Description and analysis of art works seems difficult. Without an appropriate structure, training, and experience a teacher may lack confidence in her own abilities. It feels safer for a teacher to focus on the history of the period that produced the work, the artists life, or the changes in public opinion about it. ie its contextual character.

But by undertaking, at home in her own time, her own personal art appreciation of the artworks that she is teaching formally in the classroom, she gains familiarity and confidence. This will reduce phobias of"being found out" To her personal experience she can then add her accumulated notes on context, technique and influences. This is one of the potentially most powerful uses for the S.C.A.A. model

I will now move onto the second part of the paper which is more theoretical. I have discussed how the S.C.A.A. model is very effective for an important category of purposes; but how can it be extended to achieve wider goals?
There are four major questions that must be posed.

1) to what extent are both the teacher and the student aware of what is happening in the classroom?
This is referred to as **learner awareness** . How can it be facilitated?

2) Can the model be extended? What is the role of **art language** and art criticism? This extends the discussion of learner awareness,

3) What role does **art history** play. I will make a controversial claim that an emphasis on art history inhibits art appreciation.

4) Are **different models** needed for different artwork categories and medias ? I will claim the need to use only **one model**, but to provide variation in its steps and task diversity in its application.

1) LEARNER AWARENESS

Even for use at the most junior levels and with the lowest ability classes,
the model needs extension to increase **learner awareness.** This is because the students need to know what processes are used at each phase of the model,so that they eventually become self-directed and self-monitoring - they become independent of the teacher. This is important for higher ability and senior students for obvious reasons. But it is equally important for all students because of the stated goals of art appreciation (overhead NO 3). explain some

This extension is achieved by
a) - teacher awareness of classroom processes and **verbalising** these when appropriate to faciliate student awareness
eg "good! now you have described the colours lets look and see if these colours remind you of anything- perhaps some of these colours are a symbol for something else." "Yes black is symbolic of death .Lets remember that 'cause later when we are trying to interpret what the artwork means that might help us"

b) - the role of art language as a conceptual tool, not only a descriptive one.
c) - adapting the model as appropriate for different age levels and different purposes, but still maintaining its **continuity.** (Hence extra refinements may be progressively added at appropriate levels.) Continuity ensures that the basic strategies are reinforced each time it is used.

The role of the teacher is crucial. Darby calls his model a "personal response" model. But by this he means "active student participation". An authoritian teacher, or a disorganised and unaware teacher will not get active student participation. Darby calls his model "student centred" but he does not warn that it is not **not teacher proof.** and what the teacher does is critical to what happens with this model in the classroom. The processes that occur are complex, and the model is more than student- centred, it is an **interactive model.** It is a three way interactive art appreciation model between student, artwork and teacher.

My experience as a practitioner revealed that when used by an enthusiastic and involved teacher, the processes that occur in the classroom are what is referred to in educational psychology as "Reciprocal Teaching" and in broader terms "Cognitive Apprenticeship".

"Cognitive Apprenticeship" is a **learning environment.** It is an environment designed to help students acquire an integrated set of cognitive skills through processes of 1)observation, and of 2) guided and supported practice in an appropriate context.

The art room is a learning environment where the students do have the opportunity to observe, engage in, and internalise expert strategies, in the appropriate context, with the image or object present, even if in a mediated form. The concept of a student-centred model, used for art appreciation, satisfies many of these opportunities **if** it is used in an interactive way where student and teacher are both involved with the artwork. The role of the teacher is crucial. She is the strategist whose expertise in class management allows these teaching methods to operate. The possibility of chaos and confusion is lurking if the teacher is unaware of what is happening.

In such a "reciprocal teaching" environment the teacher provides
four main functions -
a) modeling, - she demonstrates verbally, she gives examples
b) coaching, -she faciliates and coaxes verbal responses - shyer students are encouraged
c) scaffolding (or structure) - she uses the steps of the model and reinforces their responses by praise
d) and fading (or withdrawal) - when appropriate she allows the student to do more and more of the interacting with the artwork.

The role of the teacher must vary according to the developmental level of the students, their ability level, and their experience using the model for art appreciation, and the complexity of the selected artwork.

The goal is for the student to eventually internalise these processes and actually "solve problems", (ie appreciate artworks) and to generalize the use of these cognitive strategies to similar problems (ie similar artworks.) To achieve this autonomy she must
1) internalise her observations - of the artwork and the process
2) learn methods to focus her perceptions - of the artwork and the process
3) and gain conscious control of her own strategies -to analyse an artwork

The student learns what the teacher has been modeling (operational use of the S.C.A.A. model). and learns from the teacher's strategies. For example - one strategy might be to switch to another part of the problem (another Step) if he gets stuck at a particular place OR to isolate a particular image, element or symbol they do not understand and return to it later. The students also learn from each other. By sharing their responses in an interactive way, the more able students become models for the others in the classroom

As students use the S.C.A.A. successfully, they are experiencing that they do have the ability to use concepts, to understand and to analyse and criticise artworks.They therefore bring to the next artwork an increased confidence. Their self-concept of their ability to analyse artworks is enhanced.

2) ART LANGUAGE

To extend the model, conceptual art language must be added. The students need this to develop an **aesthetic frame of reference** for both appreciation and criticism. I think that the model does offer more than appreciation, but that the structure of the model is hidden by Darby's choice of everyday art language, and the omiting of lables, to make it accessible to average students and beginner teachers. Critical analysis is a cognitive level above appreciation, and therefore needs more abstract language to become operational.

I am critical of the absence of lables in the S.C.A.A. The artwork is looked at as a visual language. But the responses are made in a written or spoken language (as well as being internalised in visual memory) The link between the two is experienced, but may not be internalised and understood if there is no indication, via labelling on the model, to indicate the processes being experienced. For example, Step 2 of the model could be labelled - "describing " or "gathering visual facts" or "searching for the visual imagery". Without the use of art language the student may be learning aesthetics but not be able to use this knowledge in a written or verbal form. Even without the use of art language, some students will gain an intuitive aesthetic understanding which facilitates art production. Other students, however, require art language to translate their art appreciation into art production.

Since late1990, I have developed and used used a modified form of the S.C.A.A. model. I have added lables and conceptual art language, making the model more suitable for senior students in N.S.W. We used this in class in an interactive way, day after day, with a wide variety of "unseen" artworks, in the last weeks before the H.S.C. All the students passed the written exam and scored a mean of 39 out of 50 - which is a wonderful achievement for kids of average ability.

C.) ART HISTORY .

A controversial issue is whether an artwork can be responded to, appreciated and interpreted without reference to art history. Some argue that the S.C.A.A. is too limiting in its emphasis on the personal response, and needs, an informed background as context.

Feldman (1970) claims that his four step model can effectively be used by children as well as adults since it requires that no previous knowledge about the works to be viewed. Elsewhere Feldman says that a critic needs a wide acquaintance with art and must be a reasonably good judge of technique. He is distinguishing between the child and the professional critic here. Eisner (1972) stresses the importance of art history, and Mittler (1980) linked art criticism to art history. In his model Darby deemphasises art history. However, in discussion with him and in reading his thesis, I find that he firmly endorses the need for an art history frame of reference. "My definition of art appreciation would include art history - are they opposed to each other?" he said when he read a preliminary draft of this paper and advised me to omit this section.

Yes, I think they are opposed to each other. Not in a cultural, social, or philosophical way, and not in a common sense way. They are opposed to each other in a cognitive psychological way. Just as I would say raising children and completing housework are conflicting opposed activities, because they require different strategies and different philosophies.

Art appreciation and art history are not in conflict for students who have a cultural background, or students who are of higher intellectual ability. This view is personal, and is not backed up by systematic research, but one which my classroom experience validates for me. As a well educated person, it seems to me that art history should be important to art appreciation. But I have found that the students can, and do, appreciate artworks without an art history background, and that trying to teach factual art history separate to the processes of art appreciation does not work. It

is not the having an art history context that interferes, it is the acquiring it.

Perhaps the dilemma is because art appreciation and art history - as traditionally presented -- utilise **different cognitive processes.** Art history, like art vacabulary, is "inert knowledge" that is inaccessible to students for application in problem solving when it is learned in isolation from realistic art appreciation and artmaking. In isolation, art history does not provide an adequate basis for art appreciation. It is passive knowledge and largely inaccessible.

I am presently trialing different approaches to combine art appreciation, artmaking, and art history. My goal is to allow students to discover that what they have already found out about an artwork in a personal response, is not different to what critics, art historians and writers say - once they can find it in art books, decode it from all the rhetoric and organise it. So far I have not had much luck as the art books available are so complex and poorly structured. Few art history books give any access to the artwork; few give you an aesthetic experience; most are not written for 16 year olds. I have had more success using responses from senior students and using them with juniors, thus exending their knowledge base.

Most art teacher have an aquaintance with technique, form, and content of a range of artworks. Thus, in the classroom context, in art appreciation lessons, the teacher can compensates for students' lack of art history. She can , structure the responses so that the student "creates" a situation where she can add some art history, thus enhancing the art appreciation. eg "Yes that tree makes me feel nostalgic for the bush too. Hans Heyson painted trees like that, in a romantic way, at the beginning of this century."

But it needs to be made clear what the goal is. There is a fundamental conflict in expecting to be able to teach art history while using a personal response model. This conflict is between process and knowledge. Both are important. Both are valuable. Initially, the process of appreciation and knowledge of the historical context should be presented separately. It is only after continued experience in art appreciation and artmaking that the more able student can integrate both. **But both can and need to be relatively independent.**

I am proposing that avarage students are better able to develop aesthetic skills in appreciation than they are able to absorb historical detail about an artwork. This may seem contradictory, especially for low ability students. But it is precisely these students for whom the **process** of art appreciation is valuable **when** it is separated from art history. Only then does the appreciation of the artwork belong to the student as his own personal response. This is the the fundamental essence of Darby's model and one of its real values. For these students, art history consists of inert knowledge that has no personal meaning. Their responses to artworks make those artworks come alive and have relevence. (Show again overhead no 3 - goals of art appreciation)

What do students need to respond to an advertisement or to a mass produced photographic image or to a video clip. They can often respond better than we can with our overload of accumulated knowledge, as they are more in touch with popular culture. What do these students need to respond to a Renaissance artwork? The artist who produced the work will have different purposes, intentions and interpretations. It makes more sense to view it in the framework of their own culture. The traditional mode of teaching art history, that relies on recall of facts and descriptions, does not seem to be useful or relevant to students in their everyday lives.

I do not question the importance of an art history knowledge to some students. The context is necessary for the judgment of an artwork. It is important for certain levels of interpretation, and useful in analysis as the student has experience of the signs symbols and conventions used in their culture. The experience of seeing other artworks helps the description stage because the student is familiar with imagery organised in certain ways.

But if it comes to a choice between acquiring art history factual knowledge OR using a personal model to appreciate artworks I would certainly support the use of the latter. The student will not

know his culture in the way we academics imagine it is necessary to be cultured, but he will be far better equiped to handle the task of interpretating his contemporary environment and hence contributing to his culture in an active way.

D). TASK DIVERSITY

Should there be different models for different artworks? Should the same appreciation tasks be done again and again, with the same model and different artworks?

It is important that students begin with relatively easy artworks (ie narrative works), use everyday language and make concrete descriptions. The artworks studied need to be **sequenced.** so that a wider and wider variety of skills and strategies are required to appreciate them. Old skills need to be retained and added to and at the same time a new strategy or skill must be practicised repeatedly. Hence the need for a familiar structure ie **a consistent use of the same model.** I think it ill advised to use different models for different artworks with the same class as the repeated use of a model is building cognitive structures.

The model works for a certain time with some students, and this is as far as they will go. But for many there is the need to progress to more complex artworks, to a more developed art language, and to artworks whose interpretation is difficult because of their symbols and ideas. But these students need to use the same strategies, to build on the familiar cognitive structures, by use of the same model, but with refinements, and additions.

The use of the same model will support the integration of new knowledge and the generalisation of knowledge and skills. As students learn to apply skills to more diverse artworks their strategies no longer relate to the first context (ie artwork) but to an increasingly richer network of contexts (artworks)- hence they are accumulating an art history knowledge. But more importantly they have the skills to access any artwork, past or present, because they have the problem solving strategies developed to suit to visual imagery.

The S.CA.A. model can be criticised for trying to include too much. It is not sufficiently refined. In my experience, the generality of the model is its strength. I have been able to take the very general S.C.A.A. framework and apply it to a wide variety of specific contexts. These include classes of artwork as diverse as painting, sculpture, architecture, popularist culture, pop video clips, feminist artworks and commercial art. In applying the S.C.A.A. model to these diverse contexts, I have retained the basic structure while modifying the content. In this way, my students are able to respond to a wide range of artworks from a common conceptual basis.

My experience shows that the basic structure of the model should be consistent for the same classes over time. If it is all verbal it should remain verbal, and should retain the same sequencing, even when applied to a different classification of work. If the model is both visual and verbal, as I have been trialling with some classes, it should remain in this format for all appreciation work with the same class.

I do not think the student gets bored with using the same model. But they may get bored if the the artworks chosen are boring,non relevant and are not sequenced correctly.

The need for task diversity can be provided by varying the perceived **purpose** for analysing an artwork eg

a) an art work can be appreciated in class for fun and entertainment ie a still from the animated sit-com series the Simpsons

b) an artwork can be appreciated as a class cooperative exercise and be extended to individual essay writing

c) an exercise of art appreciation can be integrated with art making ie cooperative class appreciation exercise then in artmaking change the artwork to show the same subject in 1991.

d) there can be partial appreciation of an artwork, or series of artworks, to stress an

aspect of an artmaking project

My 1991 Year12 students recently told me they didnt want any new models and requested that we continue using exactly the same model that we used in year 11--the SCAA--because they were familiar with it.

CONCLUSION

There is a need for further research. There are other promising learning techniques developed for use in different disciplines that could be applied to the visual arts. The problem of how students can best learn the aesthetics and the strategies to appreciate and be critically aware of artworks can be approached by the further study of the use of conceptual models. If such models can improve recall of conceptual information, decrease verbatim retention and increase the transfer creatively to other artworks there will be more students with the ability to respond personally and think systematically when faced with the ever demanding visual world. These cognitive theories of learning and transfer emerging now in educational psychology should be investigated as to their applicability to the classroom needs of visual arts students and teachers.

The use of models for art appreciation and aesthetics can in theory be extended to include models that also embrace art making and art history.
A conceptual model is defined as words and or diagrams that are intended to help students build mental models of the area or system being studied. It highlights the major objects and actions in a system as well as the causal relationship between them. Applied to the study of artworks, a conceptual model helps students build the mental model of the objects and elements in an artwork, the organisational and symbolic relationship between them and arrive at an interpretation and,if they have a context, possibly a judgement. These skills and strategies could also be applied to artmaking.

There is a need for research in these issues I have raised. There is a need for practitioners to examine the theory as they experience it in the classroom. Then by discussions, journal reports and conference papers to share these experiences. My reading in preparing this paper and my personal experience as a practitioner, lead me to urge and encourage the continued development of theory in the form of models for different categories of artworks,- both high art and popular culture artworks- and the continued trialling of these models, to test the theory and to improve practice. and to promote understanding.

A final word on the S.C.A.A. It is a good model. Yes the S.C.A.A. does work in the classroom in a very positive way. Despite the criticisms and suggestions for its improvement that I have made in this paper I recommend it as the best available and enjoyable and successful strategy for developing art appreciation. And I thank you Max Darby.

The S.C.A.A. works in the classroom for art appreciation because of the social context in which learning takes place. The interactive environment creates a happy busy context; each student is expected from the beginning to contribute in the group problem solving processes; each student contributes to the other and to the final outcome;there is the availability of a model (the teacher and the better students); there are clear expectations from the teacher and the social reward of praise in front of one's peers and the opportunity to impress one's peers with original ideas and comments. At the focus of all this interaction is another "person" the **artwork** which is "created" by the group and whose "soul' is slowly revealed and interpreted and loved "appreciatively". This is a really satisfying outcome of the whole process. And one of the best parts of being a visual arts teacher is to hear a comment like this one from Rita Giacannetis in a Year 11 class -"Miss, I never knew there could be so much in a painting"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BROWN, A.L., PALINSCAR, A.S., "Guided, Cooperative Learning and Individual Knowledge Acquision" Ch 13 in "Knowing, Learning and Instruction; Essays in Honour of Robert Glaser"; ed. RESNICK, L.B. (1989), publ. ERLBAUM

COLLINS Alan, BROWN John Seely, NEWMAN Susan E; "Cognitive Apprenticeship; Teaching the Crafts of Reading, Writing and Mathematics." Ch 14 in "Knowing, Learning and Instruction; Essays in Honour of Robert Glaser"; ed. RESNICK, L.B. (1989), publ. ERLBAUM

DARBY, R.M. "Images in Life" 1986; Ministry of Education, Victoria

DARBY, R.M. "The Critical Importance of Personal Response in Art Appreciation." M.Ed. Thesis Feb. 1988.

DARBY, MAX. "The Critical Importance of a Personal Response in Art Appreciation" in Australian Art Education Vol.12 no 3, Dec1988.

FELDMAN , E.B. "The Theory of Art Criticism" (1970) esp. "Becoming Human Through Art" Chapter 15,

MAYER, R.E. Models of Understanding. Review of Educational Research,Spring 1989, Vol.59 No 1 pp 43-64

VALLANCE Elizabeth; "Harold and Helen in the Art Museum: The Object as Text"Pages 185 -201 in Socrates to Software; the Teacher as Text and the Text as Teacher; ed. P.W.Jackson; S. Harouturian-Gordon University of Chicago Press 1989.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS; The author wishes to thank Margaret Bishop, Max Darby, Assoc. Prof. Ray Debus, Dr Lyn Gow, Dr Felicity Haynes, Prof. Herb Marsh and Kevin Trimble for their suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper. The contents of this paper represents the views of the author.

OVERHEAD NO 3.

STEP 1 What is your first impression of the work?

STEP 2 What can you see?

STEP 3 What does it mean?

STEP 4 What do other people think of the work?

STEP 5 Do you like the work?

STEP 6 What is your impression of the work now? Has it changed? How?

OVERHEAD NO 4.

STEP 1 What is your first impression of the work?	INTRODUCTION IMMEDIATE PERSONAL RESPONSE
STEP 2 What can you see?	DESCRIPTION
STEP 3 What does it mean?	ANALYSIS
STEP 4 What do other people think of the work?	INTERPRETATION
STEP 5 Do you like the work?	JUDGMENT APPRECIATING/ COMMENTING
STEP 6 What is your impression of the work now? Has it changed? How?	CONCLUSION/ OPINION FINAL PERSONAL RESPONSE

OVERHEAD NO 7 SCAA -Modified version adding lables
Margaret Marsh c1991

STEP 1 What is your first impression of the work? — INTRODUCTION / IMMEDIATE PERSONAL RESPONSE

STEP 2 What can you see? - art elements
Describe -objects/images -media/technique — DESCRIPTION

-how do these go together? - objects/images - art elements -art principles -symbols -feelings/mood/emotion — ANALYSIS

STEP 3 What does it mean? -symbols -feelings/mood/emotion -ideas -message — INTERPRETATION

-how do these convey meaning? -objects/images -art elements/principles -symbols -feelings/mood/emotion — ANALYSIS / INTERPRETATION

STEP 4 What do other people think of the work? — EVALUATION / JUDGMENT

How well has it been completed? — EVALUATION / JUDGMENT

STEP 5 Do you like the work? — APPRECIATION/ JUDGMENT

STEP 6 What is your impression of the work now? Has it changed? How? — CONCLUSION/ JUDGMENT / FINAL PERSONAL RESPONSE

OVERHEAD NO 8. SCAA - Modified version for essay questions in NSW
Margaret Marsh c 1991

STEP 1 What is your first impression of the work?

AESTHETIC QUALITIES

-objects/images

AND

STEP 2 What can you see? - art elements
Describe -media/technique

VISUAL IMAGERY

- objects/images
- art elements

-how do these go together?

-art principles
-symbols
-feelings/mood/emotions

IMAGINATIVE QUALITIES and EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES

STEP 3 What does it mean?

-symbols
-feelings/mood/emotion
-ideas
-message

IDEAS MEANINGS

-how do these convey meaning?

-objects/images
-art elements/principles
-symbols
-feelings/mood/emotion

RELEVANCE TO SOCIETY

STEP 4 What do other people think of the work?

How well has it been completed?

HOW EFFECTIVELY HAS THE ARTIST USED THEM

STEP 5 Do you like the work?

IMPACT ON THE VIEWER

STEP 6 What is your impression of the work now? Has it changed ? How?